

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/694,796 11 /000410	Applicant(s) CACHOD ET AL.	
	Examiner Jamila O. Williams	Art Unit 3722	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jamila O. Williams.

(3) William Berridge.

(2) Leana Levin.

(4) Daniel Howell.

Date of Interview: 30 August 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: demo of prior art chuck and the present inventon.

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: 5,765,839.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants pointed out the difference between the prior art and present invention. The point of interest being the position of the nut relative to the locking mechanism. The examiners indicated that the present claim language does not clearly set forth the difference. Applicants indicated that on amendment this feature would be clarified. Applicants also questioned the rejection on "locking mechanism". The examiner indicated that the specification currently recites "locking means", so the language needs to be consistent.

Wier